APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/590,740	08/24/2006	Shigeki Uetabira	711/3	1224

27538   7590   07/07/2009
GIBSON & DERNIER L.L.P.
900 ROUTE 9 NORTH
SUITE 504
WOODBRIDGE, NJ 07095

EXAMINER
STEVENS, ROBERT

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2162	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
07/07/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary		10/590,740	UETABIRA ET AL.
		Examiner	Art Unit	
		ROBERT STEVENS	2162	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS,
WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>22 April 2009</u>.
2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.
3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
  closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>44-130</u> is/are pending in the application.
    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6)☒ Claim(s) <u>44-130</u> is/are rejected.
7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.
    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:
    1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
    2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
    3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
      application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3)☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>20060824, 20070508</u>.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6)☐ Other: _____.

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
PTOL-326 (Rev. 08-06)   **Office Action Summary**   Part of Paper No./Mail Date 20090630

DETAILED ACTION

1.   The Office withdraws the previous rejections of the claims under 35 USC §§101, 112-2nd

paragraph and 103(a), in light of the amendment. However, the Office sets forth new rejections

of the claims under 35 USC §103(a), in light of the amendment.

Response to Arguments

2.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims have been considered but are moot in view

of the new ground(s) of rejection.

        The Information Disclosure Statements (IDS') dated 8/24/06 and 5/8/07 have been

considered. The IDS dated 5/8/07 has been annotated to indicate that the listed Foreign

Document 10-91638 was previously submitted on 8/24/06 (making it easier to locate in PAIR).

The document listed as "ISR of PCT/JP05/015770" is currently coded in PAIR as the document

type "Documents submitted with 371 Applications". It was internally requested that this

document be re-coded as Non-Patent Literature.   Both of these documents were considered in

the updated Information Disclosure Statements.

        The previous rejection of the claims under 35 USC 101 and 112-2nd have been

withdrawn, in light of the amendments. It is noted that page 22 lines 18-24 of the Specification

discusses a hardware-based computer system, incorporating a processing unit. It is also noted

that Applicant's remarks (in the last line of page 25 in the Amendment filed 4/22/09, for

example) indicate that such language is to be interpreted as hardware.

Applicant's arguments on pages 27-32 concerning the rejection of the claims under 35

USC §103(a) appear to be primarily directed to the newly amended claim language (especially

the language directed to the calculation of a value). New rejections citing new references have

been set forth below to address the amended claim language.

Regarding the previous rejection of the claims under 35 USC 103(a), Applicant argues on

pages 30-32 that the references do not teach comparing contents to be collected with other

contents, because any "allegations that a determination that a web page has been refreshed ...

may or could involve comparison of contents is not sufficient to establish that the Hogan device

inherently compares content".

The Office respectfully disagrees, noting that the references as a whole teach the recited

claim language. First, it is unclear why Applicant has set forth these arguments. There are no

arguments in the case that a comparison may/could take place. However, it is noted that if it is

known that a "refresh" has taken place, then <u>perforce</u> a comparison has taken place. One must

have made a determination between a previous and a current state to be able to ascertain that a

refresh has occurred, and therefore a comparison must have been made.

Therefore, the references have been reasonably interpreted as teaching the recited claim

language.

For at least these reasons, the Office asserts the rejections of the claims as set forth

below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth
> in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior
> art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made
> to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be
> negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4.   **Claims 44-50, 63-77, 85 and 89 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)** as being

unpatentable over Vora et al. (US Patent No. 5,819,273, hereafter referred to as "Vora") in view

of Hurst-Hiller et al. (US Patent Application Publication No. 2006/0015573, hereafter referred to

as "Hurst-Hiller") and Christopher Bailey et al. ("Link Augmentation: A Context-Based

Approach to Support Adaptive Hypermedia", OHS/SC/AH 2001, LNCS 2266, Springer-Verlag,

Berlin, Germany, © 2002, pp. 239-251, hereafter referred to as "Bailey").

        Regarding independent claim 44: Vora teaches ***An information search provision***

apparatus comprising: at least one processing unit that operates to perform at least the steps of

acquiring a search conditional statement and providing contents, matching the search

conditional statement, as a search result; (See Vora Fig. 1 #10 showing a processor, and Fig. 2

showing memory for storing search requests, search engine code and search results/reports. See

also, col. 7 lines 20-35 discussing the issuing of requests and performing searches and col. 7

lines 50-62 discussing the search results.) ***a collection unit which collects contents, to be***

evaluated, posted on a web page via a network at a predetermined timing; (See Vora Fig. 2

#201 teaching the scheduling of a search request.)

However, Vora does not explicitly teach the remaining limitations as claimed. Hurst-

Hiller, though, discloses *and a reliability control unit which increases or decreases a degree of*

reliability of the contents to be evaluated, depending on whether or not it is possible for the

collection unit to collect the contents to be evaluated. (See Hurst-Hiller Abstract discussing

redirecting a user's search to identical content upon an HTTP 404 access failure message.)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention

to apply the teachings of Hurst-Hiller for the benefit of Vora, because to do so allowed a

designer to enhance a user's search or navigation experience, as taught by Hurst-Hiller in

paragraph [0018]. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., search

of network resources.

Additionally, Vora does not explicitly teach the remaining limitations as claimed. And,

although Hurst-Hiller does not explicitly discuss a "value" calculation, Bailey, though, teaches *a*

value, which is indicative of a degree of reliability (See Bailey page 246 item "2. An important

issue ...", which discusses the calculation of a probability value indicative of whether a page

belongs to the "Page Not Found" category. "Page Not Found" is the text associated with the

HTTP 404 error message.)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention

to apply the teachings of Bailey for the benefit of Vora in view of Hurst-Hiller, because to do so

enabled a designer to implement a more efficient search mechanism, as taught by Bailey in the

1st paragraph of section "1 Introduction" on page 239. These references were all applicable to

the same field of endeavor, i.e., search of network resources.

Regarding claim 45: Vora teaches *an acquisition unit which acquires a search*

conditional statement from a user; (See Vora col. 9 lines 38-51 describing entry of a user search

request.) *a search unit which searches contents matching the acquired search conditional*

statement; (See Vora Fig. 3B #323 and 325 teaching performance of a search request.)

However, Vora does not explicitly teach the remaining limitations as claimed. Hurst-

Hiller, though, discloses *and a reliability presenting unit which presents to the user a degree of*

reliability of the searched contents. (See Hurst-Hiller Abstract discussing detection of a 404

access error.)

Regarding claim 46: Vora does not explicitly teach the remaining limitations as

claimed. Hurst-Hiller, though, discloses *a prediction unit which predicts the degree of*

reliability of the contents to be evaluated, based on an element contributed to estimating a

duration of contents contained in the contents to be evaluated, wherein the reliability

presenting unit presents the predicted reliability to the user. (See Hurst-Hiller Abstract

discussing reception of a 404 access error indicating that a web page is inaccessible and therefore

unreliable.)

   Regarding claim 47: Vora does not explicitly teach the remaining limitations as claimed. Hurst-Hiller, though, discloses *wherein the reliability control unit gradually increases the degree of reliability of the contents to be evaluated, in a period of time during which the contents to be evaluated is acquired continuously at a predetermined timing by the collection unit.* (See Hurst-Hiller Abstract discussing redirection to sources of identical content upon a 404 access error.)

   Regarding claim 48: Vora does not explicitly teach the remaining limitations as claimed. Hurst-Hiller, though, discloses *a history increase range controlling unit which controls an increase range in the degree of reliability of the contents to be evaluated, according to a history on whether or not it is possible for the collection unit to collect the contents to be evaluated.* (See Hurst-Hiller Fig. 3 #102 showing a search history log.)

   Regarding claim 49: Vora does not explicitly teach the remaining limitations as claimed. Hurst-Hiller, though, discloses *a relationship determining unit which determines the presence or absence of a relationship between highly reliable contents and the contents to be evaluated, wherein the reliability control unit controls in a manner that an increase range of the contents to be evaluated when the presence of a relation is determined by the relationship determining unit is set higher than that when the absence thereof is determined.* (See Hurst-Hiller paragraph [0013] discussing the absence of or inability to access a page, in the context of the Abstract discussing the redirection to identical or similar content.)

Regarding claim 50: Vora teaches *wherein, based on whether or not related information indicative of the presence of a relationship between highly reliable contents and the contents to be evaluated is contained in the highly reliable contents, the relationship determining unit determines the presence or absence of a relationship between highly reliable contents and the contents to be evaluated*. (See Vora Abstract discussing the determination of content availability.)

Claim 63 is substantially similar to claim 44, and therefore likewise rejected.

Regarding independent claim 64: Vora teaches *An information search provision system, comprising: a contents providing apparatus which posts contents to be evaluated, on a web page;* (See Vora Fig. 1 #201 teaching the scheduling of a search request.) *a terminal apparatus which accesses the contents to be evaluated, via a network;* (See Vora Fig. 4A showing a search GUI running on an apparatus.) *wherein the terminal apparatus includes an information transmitting unit which transmits client information associated with the terminal apparatus,* (See Vora Fig. 2 #201 teaching the scheduling of a search request.) *and an information search provision apparatus and wherein the information search provision apparatus includes: at least one processing unit that operates to perform at least the steps of acquiring a search conditional statement and providing contents, matching the search conditional statement, as a search result;* (See Vora Fig. 1 #10 showing a processor, and Fig. 2

showing memory for storing search requests, search engine code and search results/reports. See

also, col. 7 lines 20-35 discussing the issuing of requests and performing searches and col. 7

lines 50-62 discussing the search results.) *an information receiver which receives directly or*

indirectly client information transmitted from the terminal apparatus that has accessed via the

network the contents to be evaluated; (See Vora Fig. 4A showing a search GUI that receives

search results sent to the client's IP address.)

However, Vora does not explicitly teach the remaining limitations as claimed. Hurst-

Hiller, though, discloses *and a reliability varying unit which increases or decreases a degree of*

reliability of the contents to be evaluated, based on the client information. (See Hurst-Hiller

Abstract discussing redirecting a user's search to identical content upon an HTTP 404 access

failure message.)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention

to apply the teachings of Hurst-Hiller for the benefit of Vora, because to do so allowed a

designer to enhance a user's search or navigation experience, as taught by Hurst-Hiller in

paragraph [0018]. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., search

of network resources.

Additionally, Vora does not explicitly teach the remaining limitations as claimed. And,

although Hurst-Hiller does not explicitly discuss a "value" calculation, Bailey, though, teaches *a*

value, which is indicative of a degree of reliability (See Bailey page 246 item "2. An important

issue ...", which discusses the calculation of a probability value indicative of whether a page

belongs to the "Page Not Found" category. "Page Not Found" is the text associated with the

HTTP 404 error message.)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention

to apply the teachings of Bailey for the benefit of Vora in view of Hurst-Hiller, because to do so

enabled a designer to implement a more efficient search mechanism, as taught by Bailey in the

1st paragraph of section "1 Introduction" on page 239. These references were all applicable to

the same field of endeavor, i.e., search of network resources.

Regarding claim 65: Vora does not explicitly teach the remaining limitations as

claimed. Hurst-Hiller, though, discloses *wherein the information transmitting unit transmits,*

as the client information, information related to access to the contents to be evaluated, and

wherein the reliability varying unit increases or decreases the degree of reliability of the

contents to be evaluated, according to a status of access from the terminal apparatus to the

contents to be evaluated. (See Hurst-Hiller Abstract discussing the reception of 404 error

messages based upon access ability.)

Regarding claim 66: Vora does not explicitly teach the remaining limitations as

claimed. Hurst-Hiller, though, discloses *wherein the information transmitting unit transmits,*

as the client information, information transferred from the terminal apparatus to the contents

to be evaluated, and wherein the reliability varying unit increases or decreases the degree of

reliability of the contents to be evaluated, according to the information transferred from the

terminal apparatus to the contents to be evaluated. (See Hurst-Hiller Abstract discussing the

reception of 404 error messages based upon access ability.)

Regarding claim 67: Vora does not explicitly teach the remaining limitations as

claimed. Hurst-Hiller, though, discloses *wherein when the terminal apparatus has accessed the*

contents to be evaluated, the contents providing apparatus transmits information on access

from the terminal apparatus to the contents to be evaluated and/or information transferred

from the terminal apparatus to the contents to be evaluated, from the terminal apparatus to

the information search provision apparatus. (See Hurst-Hiller Abstract discussing 404 error

messages and providing like information upon access failure.)

Regarding independent claim 68: Vora teaches *An information search provision*

apparatus including: at least one processing unit that operates to perform at least the steps of

acquiring a search conditional statement and providing contents, matching the search

conditional statement, as a search result; (See Vora Fig. 1 #10 showing a processor, and Fig. 2

showing memory for storing search requests, search engine code and search results/reports. See

also, col. 7 lines 20-35 discussing the issuing of requests and performing searches and col. 7

lines 50-62 discussing the search results.) *an information receiver which receives directly or*

indirectly client information transmitted from a terminal apparatus that has accessed the

contents to be evaluated; (See Vora Fig. 2 #201 teaching the scheduling of a search request.)

However, Vora does not explicitly teach the remaining limitations as claimed. Hurst-Hiller, though, discloses *and a reliability varying unit which increases or decreases a degree of reliability of the contents to be evaluated, based on the client information.* (See Hurst-Hiller Abstract discussing redirecting a user's search to identical content upon an HTTP 404 access failure message.)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Hurst-Hiller for the benefit of Vora, because to do so allowed a designer to enhance a user's search or navigation experience, as taught by Hurst-Hiller in paragraph [0018]. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., search of network resources.

Additionally, Vora does not explicitly teach the remaining limitations as claimed. And, although Hurst-Hiller does not explicitly discuss a "value" calculation, Bailey, though, teaches *a value, which is indicative of a degree of reliability* (See Bailey page 246 item "2. An important issue ...", which discusses the calculation of a probability value indicative of whether a page belongs to the "Page Not Found" category. "Page Not Found" is the text associated with the HTTP 404 error message.)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Bailey for the benefit of Vora in view of Hurst-Hiller, because to do so enabled a designer to implement a more efficient search mechanism, as taught by Bailey in the 1st paragraph of section "1 Introduction" on page 239. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., search of network resources.

Regarding claim 69: Vora does not explicitly teach the remaining limitations as claimed. Hurst-Hiller, though, discloses *wherein the information receiver receives, as the client information, information on a status of access from the terminal apparatus to the contents to be evaluated, and wherein the reliability varying unit increases or decreases the degree of reliability of the contents to be evaluated, according to the access status.* (See Hurst-Hiller Abstract discussing 404 access error messages and delivery of similar content if the originally requested page was inaccessible.)

Regarding claim 70: Vora does not explicitly teach the remaining limitations as claimed. Hurst-Hiller, though, discloses *wherein the information receiver receives, as the client information, information transferred from the terminal apparatus to the contents to be evaluated, and wherein the reliability varying unit increases or decreases the degree of reliability of the contents to be evaluated, according to the information transferred from the terminal apparatus to the contents to be evaluated.* (See Hurst-Hiller Abstract discussing 404 access error messages and delivery of similar content if the originally requested page was inaccessible.)

Regarding independent claim 71: Vora teaches *An information search provision system, comprising: a contents providing apparatus which posts contents to be evaluated, on a web page;* (See Vora Fig. 2 #201 teaching the scheduling of a search request.) *a terminal apparatus which accesses the contents to be evaluated, via a network;* (See Vora Fig. 4A

showing a search GUI running on an apparatus.) *wherein the terminal apparatus includes an*
information transmitting unit which transmits client information associated with the terminal
apparatus, (See Vora Fig. 2 #201 teaching the scheduling of a search request.) *and an*
information search provision apparatus and wherein the information search provision
apparatus includes: at least one processing unit that operates to perform at least the steps of
acquiring a search conditional statement and providing contents, matching the search
conditional statement, as a search result; (See Vora Fig. 1 #10 showing a processor, and Fig. 2
showing memory for storing search requests, search engine code and search results/reports. See
also, col. 7 lines 20-35 discussing the issuing of requests and performing searches and col. 7
lines 50-62 discussing the search results.) *an information receiver which receives directly or*
indirectly client information transmitted from the terminal apparatus that has accessed via the
network the contents to be evaluated; (See Vora Fig. 4A showing a search GUI that receives
search results sent to the client's IP address.)

> However, Vora does not explicitly teach the remaining limitations as claimed. Hurst-
Hiller, though, discloses *and an asset value varying unit which increases or decreases an asset*
value for the contents to be evaluated, based on the client information. (See Hurst-Hiller
Abstract discussing redirecting a user's search to identical content upon an HTTP 404 access
failure message.)

> It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention
to apply the teachings of Hurst-Hiller for the benefit of Vora, because to do so allowed a
designer to enhance a user's search or navigation experience, as taught by Hurst-Hiller in

paragraph [0018]. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., search

of network resources.

Additionally, Vora does not explicitly teach the remaining limitations as claimed. And,

although Hurst-Hiller does not explicitly discuss a "value" calculation, Bailey, though, teaches

an asset value, (See Bailey page 246 item "2. An important issue ...", which discusses the

calculation of a probability value indicative of whether a page belongs to the "Page Not Found"

category. "Page Not Found" is the text associated with the HTTP 404 error message.)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention

to apply the teachings of Bailey for the benefit of Vora in view of Hurst-Hiller, because to do so

enabled a designer to implement a more efficient search mechanism, as taught by Bailey in the

1st paragraph of section "1 Introduction" on page 239. These references were all applicable to

the same field of endeavor, i.e., search of network resources.

Regarding claim 72: Vora does not explicitly teach the remaining limitations as

claimed. Hurst-Hiller, though, discloses *wherein the information transmitting unit transmits,*

as the client information, information related to access to the contents to be evaluated, (See

Hurst-Hiller Fig. 1 #102 showing search results transmitted to the client's IP address.) *and*

wherein the asset value varying unit increases or decreases the asset value according to a

status of access from the terminal apparatus to the contents to be evaluated. (See Hurst-Hiller

Abstract discussing redirecting a user's search to identical content upon an HTTP 404 access

failure message.)

Regarding claim 73: Vora does not explicitly teach the remaining limitations as claimed. Hurst-Hiller, though, discloses *wherein the information transmitting unit transmits, as the client information, information transferred from the terminal apparatus to the contents to be evaluated,* (See Hurst- Hiller Fig. 1 #102 showing search results transmitted to the client's IP address.) *and wherein the asset value varying unit increases or decreases the asset value according to the information transferred from the terminal apparatus to the contents to be evaluated.* (See Hurst-Hiller Abstract discussing the providing of similar content if access fails.)

Regarding claim 74: Vora teaches *wherein when the terminal apparatus has accessed the contents to be evaluated, the contents providing apparatus transmits information on access from the terminal apparatus to the contents to be evaluated and/or information transferred from the terminal apparatus to the contents to be evaluated, from the terminal apparatus to the information search provision apparatus*. (See Vora Fig. 4A showing a GUI including search results.)

Regarding independent claim 75: Vora teaches *An information search provision apparatus including: at least one processing unit that operates to perform at least the steps of acquiring a search conditional statement and providing contents, matching the search conditional statement, as a search result;* (See Vora Fig. 1 #10 showing a processor, and Fig. 2

showing memory for storing search requests, search engine code and search results/reports. See

also, col. 7 lines 20-35 discussing the issuing of requests and performing searches and col. 7

lines 50-62 discussing the search results.) *an information receiver which receives directly or*

indirectly client information transmitted from a terminal apparatus that has accessed the

contents to be evaluated; (See Vora Fig. 2 #201 teaching the scheduling of a search request.)

However, Vora does not explicitly teach the remaining limitations as claimed. Hurst-

Hiller, though, discloses *and an asset value varying unit which increases or decreases an asset*

value for the contents to be evaluated, based on the client information. (See Hurst- Hiller

Abstract discussing redirecting a user's search to identical content upon an HTTP 404 access

failure message.)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention

to apply the teachings of Hurst-Hiller for the benefit of Vora, because to do so allowed a

designer to enhance a user's search or navigation experience, as taught by Hurst-Hiller in

paragraph [0018]. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., search

of network resources.

Additionally, Vora does not explicitly teach the remaining limitations as claimed. And,

although Hurst-Hiller does not explicitly discuss a "value" calculation, Bailey, though, teaches

an asset value, (See Bailey page 246 item "2. An important issue ...", which discusses the

calculation of a probability value indicative of whether a page belongs to the "Page Not Found"

category. "Page Not Found" is the text associated with the HTTP 404 error message.)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention

to apply the teachings of Bailey for the benefit of Vora in view of Hurst-Hiller, because to do so

enabled a designer to implement a more efficient search mechanism, as taught by Bailey in the 1st paragraph of section "1 Introduction" on page 239. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., search of network resources.

Regarding claim 76: Vora does not explicitly teach the remaining limitations as claimed. Hurst-Hiller, though, discloses *wherein the information receiver receives, as the client information, information on a status of access from the terminal apparatus to the contents to be evaluated, and wherein the asset value varying unit increases or decreases the asset value according to the status of access from the terminal apparatus to the contents to be evaluated.* (See Hurst-Hiller Abstract discussing 404 access error messages and delivery of similar content if the originally requested page was inaccessible.)

Regarding claim 77: Vora does not explicitly teach the remaining limitations as claimed. Hurst-Hiller, though, discloses *wherein the information receiver receives, as the client information, information transferred from the terminal apparatus to the contents to be evaluated, and wherein the asset value varying unit increases or decreases the asset value according to the information transferred from the terminal apparatus to the contents to be evaluated.* (See Hurst-Hiller Abstract discussing 404 access error messages and delivery of similar content if the originally requested page was inaccessible.)

Regarding dependent claim 85: Vora teaches *a specifying unit which specifies location information indicative of a location of the contents to be evaluated;* (See Vora Fig. 2B #431 showing a GUI capability for choosing information sources.)

However, Vora does not explicitly teach the remaining limitations as claimed. Hurst-Hiller, though, discloses *and a reliability transform unit which transforms the degree of reliability, of the contents to be evaluated, increased or decreased by the reliability control unit into a degree of reliability of the location information*. (See Hurst-Hiller Abstract discussing redirecting a user's search to identical content upon an HTTP 404 access failure message.)

Claim 89 is substantially similar to claim 85, and therefore likewise rejected.

5.   **Claims 51-62, 78-84, 86-88 and 90-124 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)** as being unpatentable over Vora et al. (US Patent No. 5,819,273, hereafter referred to as "Vora") in view of Hurst-Hiller et al. (US Patent Application Publication No. 2006/0015573, hereafter referred to as "Hurst-Hiller"), Christopher Bailey et al. ("Link Augmentation: A Context-Based Approach to Support Adaptive Hypermedia", OHS/SC/AH 2001, LNCS 2266, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Germany, © 2002, pp. 239-251, hereafter referred to as "Bailey") and Hogan et al. (US Patent No. 7,299,222, hereafter referred to as "Hogan").

   Regarding independent claim 51: Vora teaches *An information search provision*
apparatus comprising: at least one processing unit that operates to perform at least the steps of
acquiring a search conditional statement and providing contents, matching the search
conditional statement, as a search result; (See Vora Fig. 1 #10 showing a processor, and Fig. 2
showing memory for storing search requests, search engine code and search results/reports. See
also, col. 7 lines 20-35 discussing the issuing of requests and performing searches and col. 7
lines 50-62 discussing the search results.) *a collection unit which collects contents, to be*
evaluated, posted on a web page via a network at a predetermined timing; (See Vora Fig. 2
#201 teaching the scheduling of a search request.)

   However, Vora does not explicitly teach the remaining limitations as claimed. Hurst-
Hiller, though, discloses *and a reliability control unit which increases or decreases a degree of*
reliability of the contents to be evaluated according to a result of the determination by the
update determining unit. (See Hurst-Hiller Abstract discussing redirecting a user's search to
identical content upon an HTTP 404 access failure message.)

   It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention
to apply the teachings of Hurst-Hiller for the benefit of Vora, because to do so allowed a
designer to enhance a user's search or navigation experience, as taught by Hurst-Hiller in
paragraph [0018]. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., search
of network resources.

   Additionally, Vora does not explicitly teach the remaining limitations as claimed. And,
although Hurst-Hiller does not explicitly discuss a "value" calculation, Bailey, though, teaches *a*
value, which is indicative of a degree of reliability (See Bailey page 246 item "2. An important

issue ...", which discusses the calculation of a probability value indicative of whether a page

belongs to the "Page Not Found" category. "Page Not Found" is the text associated with the

HTTP 404 error message.)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention

to apply the teachings of Bailey for the benefit of Vora in view of Hurst-Hiller, because to do so

enabled a designer to implement a more efficient search mechanism, as taught by Bailey in the

1st paragraph of section "1 Introduction" on page 239. These references were all applicable to

the same field of endeavor, i.e., search of network resources.

Additionally, Vora does not explicitly teach the remaining limitations as claimed.

Hogan, though, teaches *a comparison unit which compares the collected contents to be*

evaluated with next collected contents, to be evaluated, posted on the same web page; (See

Hogan Fig. 1D #105 indicating that a search result page has been refreshed within the last 48

hours.) *an update determining unit which determines if the contents to be evaluated has been*

updated or not, based on a result of the comparison; (See Hogan Fig. 1D #105 indicating that a

search result page has been refreshed within the last 48 hours.)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention

to apply the teachings of Hogan for the benefit of Vora in view of Hurst-Hiller and Bailey,

because to do so enabled a designer to provide a system user with the ability to determine

whether access of search results is appropriate or desirable, as taught by Hogan in col. 6 lines 20-

29. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., search of network

resources.

Regarding claim 52: Vora does not explicitly teach the remaining limitations as claimed. Hurst-Hiller, though, discloses *wherein the reliability control unit gradually increases the degree of reliability of the contents to be evaluated, in a period of time during which it is determined continuously at a predetermined timing that the contents to be evaluated is updated by the update determining unit.* (See Hurst-Hiller paragraph [0018] discussing training or adjusting search service results for frequently downloaded sites.)

Regarding claim 53: Vora does not explicitly teach the remaining limitations as claimed. Hurst-Hiller, though, discloses *an update analysis unit which analyzes whether an update of the contents is intrinsically required or not, wherein the reliability control unit increases or decreases the degree of reliability of the contents to be evaluated, according to results of the update determining unit and the update analysis unit.* (See Hurst-Hiller Abstract discussing the reception of 404 access errors and redirecting to like content.)

Regarding independent claim 54: Vora teaches *An information search provision apparatus comprising: at least one processing unit that operates to perform at least the steps of acquiring a search conditional statement and providing contents, matching the search conditional statement, as a search result;* (See Vora Fig. 1 #10 showing a processor, and Fig. 2

showing memory for storing search requests, search engine code and search results/reports. See

also, col. 7 lines 20-35 discussing the issuing of requests and performing searches and col. 7

lines 50-62 discussing the search results.) *a related-contents acquisition unit which acquires*

contents related to contents to be evaluated; (See Vora Fig. 2 #201 teaching the scheduling of a

search request.)

However, Vora does not explicitly teach the remaining limitations as claimed. Hurst-

Hiller, though, discloses *and a reliability control unit which increases or decreases the degree*

of reliability of the contents to be evaluated, by referring to the extracted element. (See Hurst-

Hiller Abstract discussing redirecting a user's search to identical content upon an HTTP 404

access failure message.)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention

to apply the teachings of Hurst-Hiller for the benefit of Vora, because to do so allowed a

designer to enhance a user's search or navigation experience, as taught by Hurst-Hiller in

paragraph [0018]. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., search

of network resources.

Additionally, Vora does not explicitly teach the remaining limitations as claimed. And,

although Hurst-Hiller does not explicitly discuss a "value" calculation, Bailey, though, teaches *a*

value, which is indicative of a degree of reliability (See Bailey page 246 item "2. An important

issue ...", which discusses the calculation of a probability value indicative of whether a page

belongs to the "Page Not Found" category. "Page Not Found" is the text associated with the

HTTP 404 error message.)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention

to apply the teachings of Bailey for the benefit of Vora in view of Hurst-Hiller, because to do so

enabled a designer to implement a more efficient search mechanism, as taught by Bailey in the

1st paragraph of section "1 Introduction" on page 239. These references were all applicable to

the same field of endeavor, i.e., search of network resources.

Additionally, Vora does not explicitly teach the remaining limitations as claimed.

Hogan, though, teaches *an element extraction unit which extracts an element contributing to*

increase or decrease in a degree of reliability of the contents to be evaluated, by referring to

the acquired contents; (See Hogan Fig. 1D #105 indicating that a search result page has been

refreshed within the last 48 hours.)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention

to apply the teachings of Hogan for the benefit of Vora in view of Hurst-Hiller and Bailey,

because to do so enabled a designer to provide a system user with the ability to determine

whether access of search results is appropriate or desirable, as taught by Hogan in col. 6 lines 20-

29. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., search of network

resources.

Regarding claim 55: Vora does not explicitly teach the remaining limitations as

claimed. Hurst-Hiller, though, discloses *wherein, in terms of each aspect in evaluating the*

degree of reliability, the element extraction unit extracts an element contributing to increase

or decrease in the degree of reliability of the contents to be evaluated, and wherein the

reliability control unit increases or decreases the degree of reliability of the contents to be evaluated, by referring to the element extracted in terms of the each aspect in evaluating the degree of reliability. (See Hurst-Hiller Abstract discussing the reception of 404 access errors and redirecting to like content.)

Regarding claim 56: Vora does not explicitly teach the remaining limitations as claimed. Hurst-Hiller, though, discloses *a classifying unit which classifies each extracted element into a first group containing elements that contribute to the increase in the degree of reliability of the contents to be evaluated or a second group containing elements that contribute to the decrease in the degree of reliability of the contents to be evaluated, and wherein when the number of elements in the first group classified by the classifying unit is greater than that in the second group, the reliability control unit increases the degree of reliability of the contents to be evaluated.* (See Hurst-Hiller Abstract discussing the reception of 404 access errors and redirecting to like content.)

Regarding independent claim 57: Vora teaches *An information search provision apparatus comprising: at least one processing unit that operates to perform at least the steps of acquiring a search conditional statement and providing contents, matching the search conditional statement, as a search result;* (See Vora Fig. 1 #10 showing a processor, and Fig. 2 showing memory for storing search requests, search engine code and search results/reports. See

also, col. 7 lines 20-35 discussing the issuing of requests and performing searches and col. 7

lines 50-62 discussing the search results.) *a contents acquisition unit which acquires contents*

containing an item to be assessed; (See Vora Fig. 2 #201 teaching the scheduling of a search

request) *a contents specifying unit which specifies own contents serving as an information*

source of the item to be assessed; (See Vora Fig. 5 #431 showing a GUI button for selecting

information resources.)

   However, Vora does not explicitly teach the remaining limitations as claimed. Hurst-

Hiller, though, discloses *and a reliability control unit which increases or decreases a degree of*

reliability of the own contents and a degree of reliability of the other contents, according to the

decision made by the consistency determining unit. (See Hurst-Hiller Abstract discussing

redirecting a user's search to identical content upon an HTTP 404 access failure message.)

   It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention

to apply the teachings of Hurst-Hiller for the benefit of Vora, because to do so allowed a

designer to enhance a user's search or navigation experience, as taught by Hurst-Hiller in

paragraph [0018]. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., search

of network resources.

   Additionally, Vora does not explicitly teach the remaining limitations as claimed. And,

although Hurst-Hiller does not explicitly discuss a "value" calculation, Bailey, though, teaches *a*

value, which is indicative of a degree of reliability of the own contents (See Bailey page 246

item "2. An important issue ...", which discusses the calculation of a probability value indicative

of whether a page belongs to the "Page Not Found" category. "Page Not Found" is the text

associated with the HTTP 404 error message. If that probability is high, the page is ignored.) *a*

value, which is indicative of a degree of reliability of the other contents (See Bailey page 246

item "2. An important issue ...", which discusses the calculation of a probability value indicative

of whether a page belongs to the "Page Not Found" category. "Page Not Found" is the text

associated with the HTTP 404 error message. If the probability is low, the page is used.)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention

to apply the teachings of Bailey for the benefit of Vora in view of Hurst-Hiller, because to do so

enabled a designer to implement a more efficient search mechanism, as taught by Bailey in the

1st paragraph of section "1 Introduction" on page 239. These references were all applicable to

the same field of endeavor, i.e., search of network resources.

Additionally, Vora does not explicitly teach the remaining limitations as claimed.

Hogan, though, teaches *a consistency determining unit which determines consistency of the*

item to be assessed in a manner that the specified own contents is compared with contents, in

the acquired contents, other than the own contents; (See Hogan Fig. 1D #105 indicating that a

search result page has been refreshed within the last 48 hours.)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention

to apply the teachings of Hogan for the benefit of Vora in view of Hurst-Hiller and Bailey,

because to do so enabled a designer to provide a system user with the ability to determine

whether access of search results is appropriate or desirable, as taught by Hogan in col. 6 lines 20-

29. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., search of network

resources.

Regarding claim 58: Vora does not explicitly teach the remaining limitations as claimed. Hurst-Hiller, though, discloses *wherein when both the degree of reliability of the own contents and the degree of reliability of the other contents are high and the presence of consistency of the item to be assessed is determined by the consistency determining unit, the reliability control unit increases both the degree of reliability of the own contents and the degree of reliability of the other contents.* (See Hurst-Hiller paragraph [0018] discussing the delivery of useful information from stored web images despite an access failure.)

Regarding claim 59: Vora teaches *and a timing specifying unit which specifies timing at which the access of the access unit to the server was first successful, by referring to the correspondence,* (See Vora Fig. 7B showing a GUI for specifying access times.)

However, Vora does not explicitly teach the remaining limitations as claimed. Hurst-Hiller, though, discloses *an access determining unit which determines if an access of the access unit to the server is allowed or not;* (See Hurst-Hiller Abstract discussing the determination of access to a web page and HTTP 404 error messages.) *an access history storage which stores correspondence between a decision result by the access determining unit and timing at which the access unit has accessed the server;* (See Hurst-Hiller Fig. 3 #102 showing a search history log.) *wherein the reliability control unit starts performing a control of increasing or decreasing the degree of reliability at the specified timing.* (See Hurst-Hiller Abstract discussing redirecting a user's search to identical content upon an HTTP 404 access failure message.)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention

to apply the teachings of Hurst-Hiller for the benefit of Vora, Bailey and Hogan, because to do

so allowed a designer to enhance a user's search or navigation experience, as taught by Hurst-

Hiller in paragraph [0018]. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor,

i.e., search of network resources.

Additionally, Vora does not explicitly teach the remaining limitations as claimed.

Hogan, though, discloses *an access unit which accesses a server by referring to location*

information indicative of a location of the server open to the public through a web page; (See

Hogan Fig. 2B showing a GUI for searching the Web.)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention

to apply the teachings of Hogan for the benefit of Vora in view of Hurst-Hiller and Bailey,

because to do so enabled a designer to provide a system user with the ability to determine

whether access of search results is appropriate or desirable, as taught by Hogan in col. 6 lines 20-

29. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., search of network

resources.

Claims 60-62 are each substantially similar to claim 59, and therefore likewise rejected.

Regarding independent claim 78: Vora teaches *An information search provision*

apparatus comprising: at least one processing unit that operates to perform at least the steps of

acquiring a search conditional statement and providing contents, matching the search

conditional statement, as a search result; (See Vora Fig. 1 #10 showing a processor, and Fig. 2

showing memory for storing search requests, search engine code and search results/reports. See

also, col. 7 lines 20-35 discussing the issuing of requests and performing searches and col. 7

lines 50-62 discussing the search results.) *a collection unit which collects contents to be*

evaluated and contents, other than said evaluating contents, for use in comparison both posted

on a web page via a network at a predetermined timing; (See Vora Fig. 2 #201 teaching the

scheduling of a search request.)

However, Vora does not explicitly teach the remaining limitations as claimed. Hurst-

Hiller, though, discloses *and a reliability control unit which increases or decreases a degree of*

reliability of the contents to be evaluated, according to a result obtained from the update

determining unit. (See Hurst-Hiller Abstract discussing redirecting a user's search to identical

content upon an HTTP 404 access failure message.)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention

to apply the teachings of Hurst-Hiller for the benefit of Vora, because to do so allowed a

designer to enhance a user's search or navigation experience, as taught by Hurst-Hiller in

paragraph [0018]. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., search

of network resources.

Additionally, Vora does not explicitly teach the remaining limitations as claimed. And,

although Hurst-Hiller does not explicitly discuss a "value" calculation, Bailey, though, teaches *a*

value, which is indicative of a degree of reliability (See Bailey page 246 item "2. An important

issue ...", which discusses the calculation of a probability value indicative of whether a page

belongs to the "Page Not Found" category. "Page Not Found" is the text associated with the

HTTP 404 error message.)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention

to apply the teachings of Bailey for the benefit of Vora in view of Hurst-Hiller, because to do so

enabled a designer to implement a more efficient search mechanism, as taught by Bailey in the

1st paragraph of section "1 Introduction" on page 239. These references were all applicable to

the same field of endeavor, i.e., search of network resources.

Additionally, Vora does not explicitly teach the remaining limitations as claimed.

Hogan, though, teaches *an update determining unit which acquires respectively publication*

circumstances of a decision item involving a provider of the contents to be evaluated, about the

contents to be evaluated and the comparing contents and determines if the contents to be

evaluated is properly updated, by comparing the publication circumstance of a decision item in

the contents to be evaluated with that in the comparing contents; (See Hogan Fig. 1D #105

indicating that a search result page has been refreshed within the last 48 hours.)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention

to apply the teachings of Hogan for the benefit of Vora in view of Hurst-Hiller and Bailey,

because to do so enabled a designer to provide a system user with the ability to determine

whether access of search results is appropriate or desirable, as taught by Hogan in col. 6 lines 20-

29. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., search of network

resources.

Regarding claim 79: Vora does not explicitly teach the remaining limitations as claimed. Hogan, though, discloses *wherein when the decision item has not been posted in the contents to be evaluated at the publication of the decision item in the comparing contents, the update determining unit determines that the contents to be evaluated is not properly updated.* (See Hogan Fig. 2A #205c showing a search result that is "currently unavailable".)

Regarding claim 80: Vora does not explicitly teach the remaining limitations as claimed. Hogan, though, discloses *wherein when the decision item was posted in the comparing contents after the decision item was posted in the contents to be evaluated, the update determining unit determines that the contents to be evaluated is properly updated.* (See Hogan Fig. 1D #105 indicating that a search result page has been refreshed within the last 48 hours.)

Regarding independent claim 81: Vora teaches *An information search provision apparatus comprising: at least one processing unit that operates to perform at least the steps of acquiring a search conditional statement and providing contents, matching the search conditional statement, as a search result;* (See Vora Fig. 1 #10 showing a processor, and Fig. 2 showing memory for storing search requests, search engine code and search results/reports. See also, col. 7 lines 20-35 discussing the issuing of requests and performing searches and col. 7 lines 50-62 discussing the search results.) *a collection unit which collects contents to be*

evaluated posted on a web page via a network at a predetermined timing; (See Vora Fig. 2

#201 teaching the scheduling of a search request.)

However, Vora does not explicitly teach the remaining limitations as claimed. Hurst-

Hiller, though, discloses *and a reliability control unit which increases or decreases a degree of*

reliability of the contents to be evaluated, according to a result obtained from the identity

determining unit. (See Hurst-Hiller Abstract discussing redirecting a user's search to identical

content upon an HTTP 404 access failure message.)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention

to apply the teachings of Hurst-Hiller for the benefit of Vora, because to do so allowed a

designer to enhance a user's search or navigation experience, as taught by Hurst-Hiller in

paragraph [0018]. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., search

of network resources.

Additionally, Vora does not explicitly teach the remaining limitations as claimed. And,

although Hurst-Hiller does not explicitly discuss a "value" calculation, Bailey, though, teaches *a*

value, which is indicative of a degree of reliability (See Bailey page 246 item "2. An important

issue ...", which discusses the calculation of a probability value indicative of whether a page

belongs to the "Page Not Found" category. "Page Not Found" is the text associated with the

HTTP 404 error message.)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention

to apply the teachings of Bailey for the benefit of Vora in view of Hurst-Hiller, because to do so

enabled a designer to implement a more efficient search mechanism, as taught by Bailey in the

1st paragraph of section "1 Introduction" on page 239. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., search of network resources.

Additionally, Vora does not explicitly teach the remaining limitations as claimed. Hogan, though, teaches *an identity determining unit which determines the identity of the contents, to be evaluated, collected at different timings;* (See Hogan Fig. 1D #105 indicating that a search result page has been refreshed within the last 48 hours.)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Hogan for the benefit of Vora in view of Hurst-Hiller and Bailey, because to do so enabled a designer to provide a system user with the ability to determine whether access of search results is appropriate or desirable, as taught by Hogan in col. 6 lines 20-29. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., search of network resources.

Regarding claim 82: Vora does not explicitly teach the remaining limitations as claimed. Hogan, though, teaches *wherein the identity determining unit determines whether or not the contents to be evaluated collected at early timing is identical to part of the contents to be evaluated at subsequent timing, and wherein when it is determined that the contents to be evaluated collected at early timing is identical to part of the contents to be evaluated at subsequent timing, the reliability control unit increases the degree of reliability of the contents to be evaluated;* (See Hogan Fig. 1D #105 indicating that a search result page has been refreshed within the last 48 hours.)

   Regarding independent claim 83: Vora teaches *An information search provision*

apparatus comprising: at least one processing unit that operates to perform at least the steps of

acquiring a search conditional statement and providing contents, matching the search

conditional statement, as a search result; (See Vora Fig. 1 #10 showing a processor, and Fig. 2

showing memory for storing search requests, search engine code and search results/reports. See

also, col. 7 lines 20-35 discussing the issuing of requests and performing searches and col. 7

lines 50-62 discussing the search results.) *a collection unit which collects contents to be*

evaluated and contents, other than said evaluating contents, for use in comparison both posted

on a web page via a network at a predetermined timing; (See Vora Fig. 2 #201 teaching the

scheduling of a search request.)

   However, Vora does not explicitly teach the remaining limitations as claimed. Hurst-

Hiller, though, discloses *and a reliability control unit which increases or decreases a degree of*

reliability of the contents to be evaluated, according to a result obtained from the uniqueness

determining unit. (See Hurst-Hiller Abstract discussing redirecting a user's search to identical

content upon an HTTP 404 access failure message.)

   It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention

to apply the teachings of Hurst-Hiller for the benefit of Vora, because to do so allowed a

designer to enhance a user's search or navigation experience, as taught by Hurst-Hiller in

paragraph [0018]. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., search

of network resources.

Additionally, Vora does not explicitly teach the remaining limitations as claimed. And, although Hurst-Hiller does not explicitly discuss a "value" calculation, Bailey, though, teaches *a value, which is indicative of a degree of reliability* (See Bailey page 246 item "2. An important issue ...", which discusses the calculation of a probability value indicative of whether a page belongs to the "Page Not Found" category. "Page Not Found" is the text associated with the HTTP 404 error message.)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Bailey for the benefit of Vora in view of Hurst-Hiller, because to do so enabled a designer to implement a more efficient search mechanism, as taught by Bailey in the 1st paragraph of section "1 Introduction" on page 239. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., search of network resources.

Additionally, Vora does not explicitly teach the remaining limitations as claimed. Hogan, though, teaches *a uniqueness determining unit which compares the contents to be evaluated with the comparing contents which had already been collected at the time of collection of the contents to be evaluated and determines uniqueness of the contents to be evaluated;* (See Hogan Fig. 1D #105 indicating that a search result page has been refreshed within the last 48 hours.)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Hogan for the benefit of Vora in view of Hurst-Hiller and Bailey, because to do so enabled a designer to provide a system user with the ability to determine whether access of search results is appropriate or desirable, as taught by Hogan in col. 6 lines 20-

29. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., search of network resources.

      Regarding claim 84: Vora teaches *wherein when the contents to be evaluated is contents such that the comparing contents which had already been collected at the time of collection of the contents to be evaluated is altered, the uniqueness determining unit determines that the contents to be evaluated is not unique,* (See Vora Fig. 2B #431 showing a GUI capability for choosing information resources.)

      However, Vora does not explicitly teach the remaining limitations as claimed. Hurst-Hiller, though, discloses *and wherein the reliability control unit decreases the degree of reliability of the contents, to be evaluated, which was determined to be contents such that the comparing contents is altered.* (See Hurst-Hiller Abstract discussing the supplying of similar content.)

      It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Hurst-Hiller for the benefit of Vora, Bailey and Hogan, because to do so allowed a designer to enhance a user's search or navigation experience, as taught by Hurst-Hiller in paragraph [0018]. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., search of network resources.

Regarding claim 86: Vora teaches *a specifying unit which specifies location information indicative of a location of the contents to be evaluated;* (See Vora Fig. 2B #431 showing a GUI capability for choosing information resources.)

However, Vora does not explicitly teach the remaining limitations as claimed. Hurst-Hiller, though, discloses *and a reliability transform unit which transforms the degree of reliability, of the contents to be evaluated, increased or decreased by the reliability control unit into a degree of reliability of the location information.* (See Hurst-Hiller Abstract discussing the supplying of similar content.)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Hurst-Hiller for the benefit of Vora, Bailey and Hogan, because to do so allowed a designer to enhance a user's search or navigation experience, as taught by Hurst-Hiller in paragraph [0018]. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., search of network resources.

Claims 87-88 and 90-92 are each substantially similar to claim 86, and therefore likewise rejected.

Regarding claim 93: Vora teaches *a location information classifying unit which classifies the location information into a plurality of groups each of which belongs to a common attribute;* (See Vora Fig. 10 showing a GUI for indicating information sources.)
However, Vora does not explicitly teach the remaining limitations as claimed. Hogan, though, discloses *and a location information group reliability calculating unit which calculates a*

degree of reliability of location information for each of the plurality of classified groups. (See Hogan col. 7 line 55 – col. 8 line 2 describing availability of sources and appropriateness of sources.)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Hogan for the benefit of Vora in view of Hurst-Hiller and Bailey, because to do so enabled a designer to provide a system user with the ability to determine whether access of search results is appropriate or desirable, as taught by Hogan in col. 6 lines 20-29. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., search of network resources.

Claims 94-100 are each substantially similar to claim 93, and therefore likewise rejected.

Regarding claim 101: Vora does not explicitly teach the remaining limitations as claimed. Hogan, though, discloses *wherein the specifying unit specifies a domain name as the location information, and wherein the reliability transform unit transforms the degree of reliability of the contents to be evaluated into a degree of reliability of the domain name.* (See Hogan col. 12 lines 32-36 discussing the sorting of contents based on content source.)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Hogan for the benefit of Vora in view of Hurst-Hiller and Bailey, because to do so enabled a designer to provide a system user with the ability to determine whether access of search results is appropriate or desirable, as taught by Hogan in col. 6 lines 20-

29. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., search of network resources.

       Claims 102-108 are each substantially similar to claim 101, and therefore likewise rejected.

       Regarding claim 109: Vora does not explicitly teach the remaining limitations as claimed. Hogan, though, discloses *wherein the specifying unit specifies an IP address as the location information, and wherein the reliability transform unit transforms the degree of reliability of the contents to be evaluated into a degree of reliability of the IP address.* (See Hogan col. 7 line 58 – col. 8 line 6 discussing evaluating of the reliability of web page search results, it being noted that a web page is associated with a URL / IP address.)

       It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Hogan for the benefit of Vora in view of Hurst-Hiller and Bailey, because to do so enabled a designer to provide a system user with the ability to determine whether access of search results is appropriate or desirable, as taught by Hogan in col. 6 lines 20-29. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., search of network resources.

       Claims 110-116 are each substantially similar to claim 109, and therefore likewise rejected.

Regarding claim 117: Vora does not explicitly teach the remaining limitations as

claimed. Hogan, though, discloses *wherein the reliability transform unit calculates a degree of*

reliability of an electronic mail address including the location information, based on the

obtained degree of reliability of the location information. (See Hogan col. 7 line 58 – col. 8 line

2 discussing evaluating reliability based upon a file type.)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention

to apply the teachings of Hogan for the benefit of Vora in view of Hurst-Hiller and Bailey,

because to do so enabled a designer to provide a system user with the ability to determine

whether access of search results is appropriate or desirable, as taught by Hogan in col. 6 lines 20-

29. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., search of network

resources.

Claims 118-124 are each substantially similar to claim 117, and therefore likewise

rejected.

6.   **Claims 125-126 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)** as being unpatentable over Vora

et al. (US Patent No. 5,819,273, hereafter referred to as "Vora") in view of Hurst-Hiller et al.

(US Patent Application Publication No. 2006/0015573, hereafter referred to as "Hurst-Hiller")

and Christopher Bailey et al. ("Link Augmentation: A Context-Based Approach to Support

Adaptive Hypermedia", OHS/SC/AH 2001, LNCS 2266, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Germany, ©

2002, pp. 239-251, hereafter referred to as "Bailey") and Kremen (US Patent Application

Publication No. 2006/0053076, hereafter referred to as "Kremen").

Regarding claim 125: Vora does not explicitly teach the remaining limitations as

claimed. Kremen, though, discloses ***wherein the asset value is calculated as a function for a***

profit over a specific period, customer frequency of use during a specific period, and/or

estimated profit. (See Kremen paragraph [0033] discussing listings that generate the most profit,

and the sorting of results based on a purported met revenue. See also paragraph [0046]

discussing the ability to share revenue obtained from monetizing time-sensitive content.)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention

to apply the teachings of Kremen for the benefit of Vora in view of Hurst-Hiller and Bailey,

because to do so enabled a designer to implement a system that provided more timely and wider

exposure of time sensitive content on online networks, as taught by Kremen in col. 6 lines 20-29.

These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., search of network

resources.

Claim 126 is substantially similar to claim 125, and therefore likewise rejected.

7.   **Claims 127-130 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)** as being unpatentable over Vora

et al. (US Patent No. 5,819,273, hereafter referred to as "Vora") in view of Kremen (US Patent

Application Publication No. 2006/0053076, hereafter referred to as "Kremen").

Regarding independent claim 127: Vora teaches ***An information search provision***

system, comprising: a contents providing apparatus which posts contents to be evaluated, on a

web page; (See Vora Fig. 2 #201 teaching the scheduling of a search request.) *a terminal*

apparatus which accesses the contents to be evaluated, via a network; (See Vora Fig. 4A

showing a search GUI running on an apparatus.) *wherein the terminal apparatus includes an*

information transmitting unit which transmits client information associated with the terminal

apparatus, (See Vora Fig. 2 #201 teaching the scheduling of a search request.) *and an*

information search provision apparatus and wherein the information search provision

apparatus includes: at least one processing unit that operates to perform at least the steps of

acquiring a search conditional statement and providing contents, matching the search

conditional statement, as a search result; (See Vora Fig. 1 #10 showing a processor, and Fig. 2

showing memory for storing search requests, search engine code and search results/reports. See

also, col. 7 lines 20-35 discussing the issuing of requests and performing searches and col. 7

lines 50-62 discussing the search results.) *an information receiver which receives directly or*

indirectly client information transmitted from the terminal apparatus that has accessed via the

network the contents to be evaluated; (See Vora Fig. 4A showing a search GUI that receives

search results sent to the client's IP address.)

However, Vora does not explicitly teach the remaining limitations as claimed. Kremen,

though, discloses *and an asset value calculating unit which calculates a profit in a transaction*

related to the contents, and calculates an asset value by use of the profit. (See Kremen

paragraph [0033] discussing listings that generate the most profit, and the sorting of results based

on a purported met revenue. See also paragraph [0046] discussing the ability to share revenue

obtained from monetizing time-sensitive content.)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention

to apply the teachings of Kremen for the benefit of Vora, because to do so enabled a designer to

implement a system that provided more timely and wider exposure of time sensitive content on

online networks, as taught by Kremen in col. 6 lines 20-29. These references were all applicable

to the same field of endeavor, i.e., search of network resources.

Regarding claim 128: Vora does not explicitly teach the remaining limitations as

claimed. Kremen, though, discloses *wherein: the asset value calculating unit calculates the*

asset value by considering at least one of: a figure of the profit totaled during a certain period,

the frequency of use of regular customers, a property of a product, and by estimating a future

profit. (See Kremen paragraph [0033] discussing listings that generate the most profit, the

sorting of results based on a purported met revenue, and considerations such as revenue share

arrangements and whether a result is related to a proprietary partner. See also paragraph [0046]

discussing the ability to share revenue obtained from monetizing time-sensitive content.)

Regarding independent claim 129: Vora teaches *An information search provision*

apparatus including: at least one processing unit that operates to perform at least the steps of

acquiring a search conditional statement and providing contents, matching the search

conditional statement, as a search result; (See Vora Fig. 1 #10 showing a processor, and Fig. 2

showing memory for storing search requests, search engine code and search results/reports. See

also, col. 7 lines 20-35 discussing the issuing of requests and performing searches and col. 7

lines 50-62 discussing the search results.) *an information receiver which receives directly or*

indirectly client information transmitted from a terminal apparatus that has accessed the

contents to be evaluated; (See Vora Fig. 4A showing a search GUI that receives search results

sent to the client's IP address.)

     However, Vora does not explicitly teach the remaining limitations as claimed. Kremen,

though, discloses *and an asset value calculating unit which calculates a profit in a transaction*

related to the contents, and calculates an asset value by use of the profit. (See Kremen

paragraph [0033] discussing listings that generate the most profit, and the sorting of results based

on a purported met revenue. See also paragraph [0046] discussing the ability to share revenue

obtained from monetizing time-sensitive content. See also paragraph [0044] discussing the

ability to increase the value and prices that can be charged.)

     It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention

to apply the teachings of Kremen for the benefit of Vora, because to do so enabled a designer to

implement a system that provided more timely and wider exposure of time sensitive content on

online networks, as taught by Kremen in col. 6 lines 20-29. These references were all applicable

to the same field of endeavor, i.e., search of network resources.

     Claim 130 is substantially similar to claim 128, and therefore likewise rejected.

Conclusion

8.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's

disclosure.

US Patent Application Publications

Eiron et al	2005/0256860
Gross et al	2005/0131884
Wolton et al	2004/0030741
Rebane et al	2004/0088241
Pitkow et al	2002/0016786

US Patents

Eiron et al	7,251,654
Pitkow et al	7,031,961

9.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this

Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a).

Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

        A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this

final action.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Robert Stevens whose telephone number is (571) 272-4102. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 6:00 - 2:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John E. Breene can be reached on (571) 272-4107. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Robert Stevens/
Examiner
Art Unit 2162

June 30, 2009